REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-44 are rejected. No claims are amended herein.

101 Rejection

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because "the claims raise questions as to whether the claims are directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101." The Applicants respectfully disagree with these contentions of the Examiner. It should be appreciated that the claimed method produces a result that is manifestly concrete, useful and tangible as content validation is a concrete and non-abstract process that is used to materially assist individuals in their consideration of or decisions about content by providing information thereabout.

Claims 22-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the "computer readable medium recited in the claims are not limited to tangible medium". This contention is not understood by the Applicants. Moreover, the Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for the rejection of Claims 22-33 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is not clearly articulated. Nevertheless, as discussed above, the Applicants respectfully disagree that the operations executed in association with a reading of a computer readable medium are not tangible. As discussed above, it should be appreciated that the claimed method produces a result that is manifestly concrete, useful and tangible

as content validation is a concrete and non-abstract process that is used to materially assist individuals in their consideration of and/or decisions about content by providing information thereabout.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28 and 31-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Net Nanny Software International Inc. (September 12, 2000) in view of Petersen (USP 6401041). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are recited in Claims 1-6, 9-17, 20-28 and 31-39 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Net Nanny Software International Inc. (September 12, 2000) in view of Petersen (USP 6401041).

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which sets forth that an embodiment of the present invention includes a method for user review and validation of content comprising:

> ...displaying said content; and displaying an indication of a state of a user's validation of said content, wherein said state of said user's validation of said content corresponds to: content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation.

Independent Claims 12, 23 and 34 recite limitations similar to those found in Claim 1. Claims 2-6, 9, 10 and 11 depend from Claim 1, Claims 13-17 and 20-22 depend from Claim 12, Claims 24-28 and 31-33 depend from Claim 23 and Claims 35-39 depend from Claim 34. These claims recite further features of the claimed invention.

Net Nanny Software International Inc. does not anticipate or render obvious a method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the status of a user's review and validation of the content that includes "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations). In order to meet the aforementioned limitation of Claim 1 a reference must show or suggest, either expressly or inherently, along with the other limitations set forth in the Claims: (1) the display of the status a user's review of content; and (2) where at least one status cautions use because the content has not been reviewed.

The Net Nanny Software International Inc. reference does not teach or suggest these claim limitations. The Net Nanny Software International Inc. reference only teaches a system that provides content based evaluations or ratings of television programs, movies, video games etc. As such, The Net Nanny Software International Inc. reference is primarily concerned with the provision of comments that merely characterize data. The Net Nanny Software International Inc. reference does not teach or suggest that a user positively indicate whether or not the user has reviewed content where one review status indicator that is displayed cautions use of the content because the content has not been reviewed. More specifically, the connecting of a cautioning of content use to the lack of user review is not taught or suggested by the Net Nanny Software International Inc. reference.

It should be appreciated that the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 feature user provided validations that not only characterize

data ("positive validation", "negative validation" etc.) but also characterize the status of a users' review ("not reviewed", "reviewed") of the data. Moreover, the claims expressly set forth that the characterizations that are made are displayed to the end user. Nowhere in the Net Nanny Software International Inc. reference is there taught or suggested a system or method for user review and validation of content that includes displaying an indication of the state of a user's validation of the content where the state of the validation of the content may correspond to "content not reviewed by user, use with caution; or content reviewed by user with a positive validation; or content reviewed by user with a negative validation" as is recited in Claim 1 (Claims 12, 23 and 34 contain similar limitations).

Petersen does not teach or suggest a modification of the Net Nanny Software International Inc. reference that would remedy its deficiencies as outlined above. Petersen only teaches an agricultural reporting system that uses colors (in the text referred to by the Examiner) to indicate the health status of crops. Petersen in no way teaches or suggests that the status of a review of content be displayed. Further, there is no connecting of a cautioning of content use to the lack of review. As such, even if Net Nanny Software International Inc. is modified as is suggested by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as outlined in Applicants' claims would not be produced. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 12, 23 and 34 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Petersen.

Accordingly, the Applicants also respectfully submit that Petersen does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2-6, 9, 10 and 11 which depend from Claim 1, Claims 13-17 and 20-22 which depend from Claim 12, Claims 24-28 and

31-33 which depend from Claim 23 and Claims 35-39 which depends from Claim 34. Consequently, these Claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claims 7, 18, 29 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a as being unpatentable over Net Nanny Software International Inc. in view of Petersen (USP 6401041) and Gill et al. (WO 0052590 A1). Gill et al. does not teach or suggest a modification of Net Nanny Software International or Petersen that would remedy the deficiencies of these references outlined above. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 7, 18, 29 and 40 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Net Nanny Software International Inc. in view of Petersen and Gill et al.

Claims 8, 19, 30 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Net Nanny Software International Inc. in view of Petersen (USP 6401041) and Solimene et al. (USP 5828376). Solimene et al. does not teach or suggest a modification Net Nanny Software International or Petersen that would remedy the deficiencies of these references outlined above. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 8, 19, 30 and 41 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Net Nanny Software International Inc. in view of Petersen and Solimene et al.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed remarks, the Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims.

The Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: _9/30_, 2005

Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No. 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060